

data storage device is coupled to the “I/O controller” that has the low speed arbiter – not “system controller” as stated in the office action. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

In addition, with respect to claim 24, the office action argues that the data storage device, such as the CD ROM in Kelley, is equivalent to the “claimed data storage device when it is connected to a high speed bus that is coupled to the bridge.” However, this language does not address the language in the claim requiring the data storage device to be coupled to an I/O controller, that includes a low speed bus arbiter, that transmits data at a data rate higher than the data rate of the low speed bus arbiter. For example, as noted in Applicants’ Specification (see for example, page 6, 2nd paragraph) the bus connecting the hard drive, for example, to the I/O controller may be a high speed bus thereby keeping the hard drive on a bus separate from the low speed bus to avoid bandwidth problems and improve system performance. Such a structure is not disclosed in the references. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 18, Applicants respectfully note that their previous arguments do not appear to have been addressed since it appears that the structure alleged to correspond to Applicants’ claimed structure in Iachetta is not shown in Iachetta. If the rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request a showing as to how the high speed arbiter 710 of Iachetta, which is alleged to correspond to Applicants’ high speed arbiter, and the structure 810 of Iachetta, which is alleged to be the claimed I/O controller are coupled to one another as required in the claim since only Iachetta is cited as teaching this connection of these claimed components. Applicants are unable to find such a coupling in Iachetta and therefore the claim is allowable.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. In addition, Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made in the previous response.

Claims 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iachetta and Kelley. Applicants respectfully reassert the remarks made in the previous office action with respect to Iachetta and Kelley and as such, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/8/06

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60601
312/609-7500
312/609-5005 Facsimile